



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/444,791	05/19/1995	MANFRED BROCKHAUS	9191	5613

151 7590 03/26/2003

HOFFMANN-LA ROCHE INC.
PATENT LAW DEPARTMENT
340 KINGSLAND STREET
NUTLEY, NJ 07110

EXAMINER

SCHWADRON, RONALD B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1644

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003

29

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/444,791

Applicant(s)

Brockhaus et al.

Examiner

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 21, 2003
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 66-68, 70-84, and 86-99 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 71, 74-78, 81, 87, 90-94, and 97 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 66-68, 70, 72, 73, 79, 80, 82-84, 86, 88, 89, 95, 96, 98, and 99 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 07/580,013.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

1. Claims 66-68,70,72,73,79,80,82-84,86,88,89,95,96,98,99 are under consideration. Claims 69 and 85 have been canceled. Claims 66-68,84 have been amended. Regarding applicants comments, the previously enunciated species election meets the relevant criterion for species election as enunciated in the pertinent sections of the MPEP.

RESPONSE TO APPLICANTS ARGUMENTS

2 The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention

3. Claims 66-68,70,72,73,79,80,82-84,86,88,89,95,96,98,99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants arguments have been considered and deemed not persuasive.

The specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed invention. The legal standard for sufficiency of a patent's (or a specification's) written description is whether that description "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the . . . claimed subject matter", *Vas-Cath, Inc. V. Mahurkar*, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the instant case, the specification does not convey to the artisan that the applicant had possession at the time of invention of the claimed inventions.

The only nucleic acids encoding a sequence comprising soluble portions of insoluble TNF binding proteins of a TNF receptor disclosed in the specification are those disclosed in Figures 1 and 4, wherein the sequences encode a 55kD or 75Kd receptor. Regarding claims that specify the 55kD receptor, said claims would encompass DNA

encoding alleles, variants and mutants of said 55kD receptor, wherein the only nucleic acid encoding a 55kD TNF receptor is that disclosed in the specification is that of Figure 1. Thus, the written description provided in the specification is not commensurate with the scope of the claimed inventions. In view of the aforementioned problems regarding description of the claimed invention, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of the invention claimed herein. See *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company*, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404-7 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 1995) the inventors claimed a genus of DNA species encoding insulin in different vertebrates or mammals, but had only described a single species of cDNA which encoded rat insulin. The court held that only the nucleic acids species described in the specification (i.e. nucleic acids encoding rat insulin) met the description requirement and that the inventors were not entitled to a claim encompassing a genus of nucleic acids encoding insulin from other vertebrates, mammals or humans, *id.* at 1240. In the instant case, the specification has disclosed a single nucleic acid encoding a 55kD TNF receptor with the nucleic acid sequence disclosed in Figure 1. The Federal Circuit has held that if an inventor is "unable to envision the detailed constitution of a gene so as to distinguish it from other materials. . .conception has not been achieved until reduction to practice has occurred", *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co, Ltd.*, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Attention is also directed to the decision of *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company* (CAFC, July 1997) wherein is stated: The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 222 USPQ 369, 372-373 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material.

Thus, as we have previously held, a cDNA is not defined or described by the mere name "cDNA," even if accompanied by the name of the protein that it encodes, but requires a kind of specificity usually achieved by means of the recitation of the sequence of nucleotides that make up the cDNA. See *Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

Regarding applicants comments, it appears that claims that specify DNA encoding the 55kD receptor would encompass DNA encoding alleles, variants and mutants of said 55kD receptor, wherein the only nucleic acid encoding a 55kD TNF receptor disclosed in the specification is that disclosed in Figure 1. Thus, the written description provided in the specification is not commensurate with the scope of the claimed inventions. In view of the aforementioned problems regarding description of the claimed invention, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of the invention claimed herein. See *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company*, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404-7 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 1995) the inventors claimed a genus of DNA species encoding insulin in different vertebrates or mammals, but had only described a single species of cDNA which encoded rat insulin. The court held that only the nucleic acids species described in the specification (i.e. nucleic acids encoding rat insulin) met the description requirement and that the inventors were not entitled to a claim encompassing a genus of nucleic acids encoding insulin from other vertebrates, mammals or humans, *id.* at 1240.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 66-68,70,72,79,80,82,84,86,88,95,96,98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schall et al. in view of Capon et al. (US Patent 5428130). Applicants arguments have been considered and deemed not persuasive.

Schall et al. teach the nucleic acid sequence encoding an insoluble (eg. membrane bound) TNF receptor (see Figure 1(a), wherein said sequence encodes a receptor that is about 55kD (eg. 415 amino acids, wherein the molecular weight would be 50,578, plus carbohydrate weight because the molecule is glycosylated, see page 368, first column, first complete paragraph)). Schall et al. teach the extracellular portion of said molecule (see page 362). The extracellular portion of the membrane bound molecule would be a soluble portion of said molecule. Schall et al. do not teach a nucleic acid encoding an Ig/soluble

portion of a 55kD TNF receptor. Capon et al. teach DNA encoding Ig/ligand binding fusion proteins (see column 5). Capon et al. teach that the Ig/ligand binding fusion protein can contain the soluble portion of a cell surface receptor (eg. the receptor minus the transmembrane and cytoplasmic domains, see column 8, first complete paragraph). Capon et al. teach that the DNA encoding the Ig portion of the fusion protein can contain at least the hinge, CH2 and CH3 domains of the constant region of an Ig heavy chain or the Fc portion of the heavy chain (see column 10, second paragraph). Capon et al. teach vectors containing said DNA (see column 26). Capon teach the use of IgG-3 constant region in said fusion proteins (see claim 3). Capon et al. teach that the ligand binding portion of the Ig/ligand binding fusion protein can be derived from a wide variety of different known cell surface receptors (see column 7, third paragraph from bottom). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have created the claimed invention because Schall et al. teach the nucleic acid sequence encoding an insoluble (eg. membrane bound) 55kD TNF receptor while Capon et al. teach DNA encoding soluble Ig/ligand binding fusion proteins wherein the ligand binding protein is a soluble portion derived from a cell surface receptor. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do the aforementioned because Capon et al. teach that the ligand binding portion of the Ig/ligand binding fusion protein can be derived from a wide variety of different known cell surface receptors (see column 7, third paragraph from bottom) and that said fusion proteins have a variety of a uses (see column 4).

Regarding applicants comments about priority document Swiss Patent application No. 746/90, *the claimed invention (eg. a DNA encoding a chimeric peptide)* is not disclosed in said application. Therefore, the claimed invention does not receive priority to said application regarding the application of prior art. The issue of the disclosure of said application versus the disclosure of Schall et al. is not germane to this issue. Regarding applicants comments about motivation to create the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do have created the claimed invention because Capon et al. teach that the ligand binding portion of the Ig/ligand binding fusion protein can be derived from a wide variety of different known cell surface receptors (see column 7, third paragraph from bottom) and that said fusion proteins have a variety of a uses (see column 4), whilst Schall et al. teach the nucleic acid sequence encoding an insoluble (eg. membrane bound) 55kD TNF receptor.


6. No claim is allowed.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 at (703) 308-4242.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Ron Schwadron whose telephone number is (703) 308-4680. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 to 6:00. A message may be left on the examiners voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Christina Chan can be reached on (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


RONALD B. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1600-4600

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1644